THEOLOGY

VOL. XLV OCTOBER, 1942 No. 268

Good or Great Bishops?

"GOOD people here are much scandalized at Thirlwall's being made a bishop," wrote Edward FitzGerald on hearing that his former tutor had been nominated by Lord Melbourne to the see of St David's. "I do not think, however, that I would have made him bishop: I am all for good and not great bishops." The comment springs involuntarily to mind on reading the first volume of Bishop Hensley Henson's autobiography,[1] which includes the story of his own nomination by Mr Lloyd George to the see of Hereford. It was an appointment which scandalized many avowedly "good people." It raised also in this present century, in an acute form, the question whether the Church of England needed merely "good" bishops or great bishops. Upon the answer to this question the chief importance and interest of Bishop Henson's *Retrospect* turn.

It is fortunate that the author has written the story of his life. It had been an open secret that he had kept a familiar journal containing his contemporary impressions of events and persons related to his life. A posthumous biographer, if not denied access to its pages, might have hesitated long how much to include of its contents. Bishop Henson has taken this responsibility upon himself. Moreover, his style, always one of his distinguishing and distinguished characteristics, lends a vigour and interest to his account which few biographers could have approached. On the other hand, it is only just to the author to observe that another of his outstanding characteristics militates against his success. He has always disliked the demonstrative display of emotion, and he has never worn his heart on his sleeve. Particularly he has a dislike of emotional display in religion. He has therefore passed upon himself a self-denying ordinance which forbids him to recount the affection inspired by his ministry and personality, whilst giving full rein to his mordancy of pen. In this respect a biographer would have found less difficulty in painting the high lights no less than the shadows.

The record of Bishop Henson's life is by no means unimportant, for he has played a large and prominent part in the ecclesiastical history of his epoch. He himself would wish his autobiography to be regarded more from the public than from the individual standpoint. So considered, it is not less interesting or important. He was reared in a narrow and intense Evangelical piety. Indeed, there is a note of eighteenth-century archaism in the action of his father in forsaking his parish church in Broadstairs when the incumbency was transferred from an Evangelical to a Highchurchman, and presenting a site for the building of a Congregational church! In reaction from the un-

[1] *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, vol. i. By H. Hensley Henson. Oxford University Press. 16s.

attractiveness of this tradition, Hensley Henson became a Tractarian. It is plain that this reaction (like that of a modern Fellow of All Souls in his account of *A Cornish Childhood*) was emotional and without intellectual conviction, and therefore could not endure. Dr Henson came up to Oxford as an unattached student, and a very poor student financially, until he won an All Souls Fellowship which set his feet in a large room. Even the enfranchisement of All Souls, however, did not remove all the clinging disabilities of poverty; and to this circumstance recurrent reference is made. Although Dr Henson's career is consoling evidence that the Church still provides a prospect of a poor man's rising to the highest ecclesiastical office, it is a reminder also that financial poverty is often a continuing hindrance. "I am a *novus homo*; I am a poor man," he observed at the time of his nomination to Hereford; and again, at the close of the first year of his episcopate he reckoned among "three conditions of failure," poverty: "I cannot move with freedom through lack of money, nor can I wield the manifold influence which money gives." Compared with the aristocratic traditions of Gore or Talbot, Dr Henson suffered severe handicaps. As a bishop, he recognized the same crippling effect of poverty on the parochial clergy. It leaves a mark not only upon a man's work but upon his character. The point is worthy of consideration; for it lies at the root of all successful reform in the Church of England.

Even more emphatic is the testimony of Dr Henson's record to the hazards of independence of mind and judgment in a churchman. The author has never lacked the courage of his convictions; nor has he ever sought the easy way to preferment by popularity and complaisance. At the age of forty-five he declined the offer of the Regius Professorship of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford for reasons which do him the highest credit:

> I have always thought, and often said, that the chairs at the universities ought to reward and encourage sound learning in the strict sense of the phrase. If I had become professor, the most I could have dared to hope for would have been the kind and measure of success which Stanley obtained. But in the interval since Stanley held the chair, an immense change has come in historical studies. . . . It would be humiliating to embody a conception of my office which I did not approve and could not defend.

When he outgrew his undergraduate belief in the Apostolic Succession, he made public his change of mind in a series of sermons preached as canon in residence of Westminster Abbey, thereby provoking much controversy. In like manner he stood forward as the champion and defender of the "liberal" clergy who were involved in difficulties with their bishops in regard to the clauses of the Apostles' Creed concerning the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of our Lord. In matters of public policy he was fearless in his denunciation of the Putumayo atrocities, and in his refusal to be misled into seeking a short-cut to the solution of social problems by iteration of shibboleths. Meantime he had devoted himself with single-minded zeal to the fulfilment of a didactic and edificatory preaching ministry, seeking therein his vocation as a minister of God's Word. His sermons have filled several published

volumes; and the reader may form his own conclusions as to the success of this aspect of Dr Henson's ministry. The present writer, not unfamiliar with the greater part of his publications, believes that the sermons need not fear comparison with the historical writings. There is a note of urgent importance for the Church, therefore, in the author's confession:

> I am bound to acknowledge that, as I review my career, I am sometimes disposed to think that I should have made a better use of my time if I had not devoted so much of it to the composition and delivery of sermons. The modern world seems to have outgrown preaching, and there is no sign that its tendency will alter.

But fundamentally it is noteworthy that Dr Henson's preferment has been due largely, if not exclusively, to the prime ministers. Lord Salisbury put forward his name for a residentiary canonry of Westminster Abbey (an example followed after an interval of forty years by Mr Churchill), Mr Asquith for the deanery of Durham, and Mr Lloyd George for the bishoprics of Hereford and Durham. The reader of the Bishop of Chichester's *Randall Davidson* and of Dr Henson's *Retrospect* can hardly avoid the suspicion that high ecclesiastical preferment would not have come Dr Henson's way if the decision had been left to the archbishop, who would probably have been much relieved had he succeeded in persuading the canon of Westminster to retire in decent obscurity to the canon-professorship at Oxford. It is worthy of consideration whether prime ministers may not be better bishop-makers than primates, provided they bring to this responsible duty the interest and information of Asquith.

The reader of Dr Henson's record may not evade, however much he would like to do so, the duty of passing opinion upon the episode of the author's nomination to the see of Hereford. It is a sorry story. The chief actor in the scene admits fully and without reserve the *gravamen* of the case against him—namely, the ebullience of style and immoderacy of expression which had characterized some of his published works. But this is all that can be said against the appointment. On the other side, any reader of the pamphlet put out by the E.C.U., and purporting to describe *Dr Henson's Opinions*, must blush to perceive the worst tactics of political misrepresentation applied to religious questions. One of the most judicious surveys of an unhappy controversy was that contributed to the *Church Quarterly Review* in April, 1918, by Dr Headlam (now Bishop of Gloucester), whose pen, even when friendly to persons and causes, has never lacked mordant criticism also! It is impossible to escape the justice of his comment on the E.C.U. production: "We have taken the trouble to spend a little time looking up some of the references in the original passages, and we are bound to say that a more misleading, a more incorrect, a more untrue representation of what Dr Henson teaches, it is difficult to conceive." On the purely personal issue, Dr Henson was undoubtedly right in refusing to publish any explanation of his opinions for the satisfaction of Bishop Gore and other bishops. He evidently disliked the pressure put upon him by Davidson to issue a statement, in response to the archbishop's request for

reassurance. The biography of Davidson by the Bishop of Chichester has made plain that Sir Lewis Dibdin was opposed to the attempt to extract from the bishop-elect any statement concerning his theological position. Probably Davidson was unfair in the pressure which he brought to bear upon Dr Henson; but since he was so insistent, "any fair-minded person must see that I could hardly refuse to answer the archbishop, and that, if I did answer, I could hardly say less than I said. But I don't like having to say anything." Since the publication of Dr Bell's *Randall Davidson*, which made plain the actual words added by Dr Henson to the statement drafted by the archbishop and their crucial significance, it has been abundantly plain that the bishop-elect made no retractation. At the time this was not so clear. Gore clearly interpreted it as such; and as clearly Dr Henson contended that "on the whole I am inclined to think that my letter does *not* read like a cowardly surrender, which assuredly in my design it was *not*." The E.C.U., moreover, agreed with Dr Henson, since they continued to press for a formal disavowal of his published opinions. "A mere letter—and a jaunty one at that—was an insufficient expiation of heresy," comments the biographer of Lord Halifax; "what was demanded was a formal recantation."

The episode would not be worth recollection if its relevance were merely personal, painful as that aspect was, and still is, in retrospect to Dr Henson. It has, however, two points of public importance. One is whether clergymen unable to affirm positively the mode of the Incarnation and Resurrection should be permitted to minister in the Church of England. The famous resolution of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in 1914 on clerical subscription was clearly intended to differentiate between denial and suspension of judgment. Dr Henson makes abundantly clear that his own position was never denial, and at lowest a simple suspension of judgment. It must therefore be recorded that he was right in maintaining that his position was definitely comprehended within the meaning of the episcopal resolution; and that Gore was wrong in his explicit statement: "I think Dr Henson falls outside the limits of tolerable conformity as recognized in our recent declaration in Convocation. I think we ought not to accept him as a brother bishop: I am in my own mind convinced that I cannot."

The second important point may be best stated in Dr Henson's own words—viz., "that there are two standards of orthodoxy in the Church of England, so that teaching which is rightly tolerated in a priest becomes intolerable in a bishop." The danger is not wholly illusory; for it is interesting to observe that in his introduction to the report on *Doctrine in the Church of England* the present Archbishop of Canterbury, being then Archbishop of York, wrote: "In view of my own responsibility in the Church I think it right here to affirm that I wholeheartedly accept as historical facts the birth of our Lord from a virgin mother and the resurrection of His physical body from death and the tomb." It would seem that any approach to acceptance of the position of two standards of orthodoxy, one for presbyters and another for bishops, is fraught with dangerous possibilities.

So far as Dr Henson himself was concerned, there was one unfortunate aspect of the controversy, the effects of which could not be easily discounted. A considerable number of bishops, not contenting themselves with a silent expression of dissent by absenting themselves from his consecration, had declared publicly their inability conscientiously to assist at that solemnity. Obviously the position of the new bishop amongst his episcopal brethren, alike in Convocation and at the private meetings of bishops at Lambeth, was difficult in these circumstances. "As I recall my episcopate, I cannot fail to see that the effect of that unfortunate start was lasting. From the first up to the last, as well in agreement as in opposition to the general view, I always felt a bleak consciousness of isolation in the official meetings of the bishops." Furthermore, Dr Henson entered upon his episcopate with a goodly legacy of causes previously supported, which must necessarily affect his episcopal policy. He had been a keen supporter of the cause of reuniting the Church of England with the other churches of the Reformation alike at home and abroad. He had expressed strong views on national popular education, and upon marriage and divorce. Many questions remained to be answered when the storm of controversy had subsided and he was enthroned as Bishop of Hereford.

The answer to the question posed at the outset of this review—"good or great bishops?"—cannot be given now. For Dr Henson's first volume ends with his translation to Durham in 1920—that is, with less than three years of episcopal experience. It affords, therefore, insufficient evidence for an answer. It closes indeed upon a welcome and happy note; for whatever opinion may be entertained about the warmth of welcome received by him at Hereford, there can be no doubt about the eager desire of laity and clergy to welcome him back to Durham. That is the most significant and important feature of this first volume. It was both a verdict on his tenure of the deanery of Durham and a prophecy of his episcopate there. For the further recording of that story we must wait. It should provide the answer to FitzGerald's observation, whether "good" or great bishops are to be preferred. Perhaps it may resolve the riddle by showing that the antithesis is unreal, and that Dr Henson, admittedly (in FitzGerald's phrase) a great bishop, was also a good bishop; and that the lay prime ministers were right against the ecclesiastics in seeing in his previous ministry the factors to make him *vere episcopabilis*.

Oxford. Norman Sykes.

Luther : the Catholic Caricature

Since Luther was Luther, a legend and a caricature were both inevitable. But, then, what was Luther? He seems to have been all things to all Protestants: to popular piety, that "Hero of Wittenberg" whose wartless portrait stares with mild benevolence; the Doctor Evangelicus of Lutheran orthodoxy; to the Pietists, the wrestling Jacob of faith; in the eyes of the Enlightenment, "a raving monk," though "an excellent citizen"; to the Romantics, the great German genius; to

the Ritschlians, prophet of a new ideal of perfection; to the Liberal Protestants the architect of freedom; and now, a Luther who, so to speak, smokes a pipe, and says "Nein" with a Swiss accent. His enemies have not been more agreed about him than his friends, and the sharp etchings of the radical Protestants have little more in common with the Catholic cartoons than the melancholy consensus that Martin Luther, though lamentably Memorable, was a Bad Thing.

The most balanced judgment might split upon the dialectic of a personal character which has left problems enough. Like St Jerome, Luther had physical excuse for occasional tantrums; but Melanchthon did not find it easier to manage his bear with a sore head than Rufinus to soothe the lion with a sore foot, and posterity, left with the comments of both friends in a huff, is prone to forget that their remarks betray contagious inflammation. Once his blood was up, Luther would charge into battle with reckless pen, and when the first impetus of righteous indignation had spent itself sheer pig-headedness would keep him going, while on such occasions he delighted to greet the scared expostulations of timid friends with something really shocking. (It has to be admitted on his behalf that his few attempts to roar them as gently as any sucking dove were usually unappreciated and invariably misunderstood.) These things carry the moral that there is no simple truth about Luther: his writings accentuate the difficulty. For, notoriously, he knew how to write: not Sir Thomas More or Rabelais had more violent and varied ways of calling a spade a spade. In the slanging matches which brightened theological existence in that day, Luther could usually contrive the last and rudest word. His sense of humour was elephantine, large and clumsy, and since his guffaws and leg-pulls often missed their contemporary objective it may be imagined what potential misconception they bequeathed to owl-like theologians fumbling with "the jocular element." His literary output was prodigious, and much of it polemic which refused to wait upon his second thoughts. It goes without saying that he who goes scavenging through all his writings will find things shocking to contemporary, and even perennial, taste; it must be said that to concentrate the muck within a dozen pages gives a wholly false impression. When their relative dimensions are considered, the eighty odd volumes of Luther's works can stand quantitative and qualitative comparison with the few thousand pages of Sir Thomas More, though Luther would have drawn the line at the "merry tales" which deface the pages of the humanist. But if the historian has thus a vast material of undoubted authenticity, there is a penumbra which is his titillation and despair. To this class belong many of Luther's own jottings, notes made by students of his lectures, reports of what people thought they remembered of his sermons, and, above all, the garbled and fuddled remembrances of half a dozen inferior Boswells who were permitted to infest his table. If in all this there is historical evidence of priceless value, there is so much else that it is possible, with judicious selection, to quote texts for any assertion about Luther to fit any thesis whatsoever.

There is another difficulty, the matter of the Reformation. "Luther apart from the Reformation would not be Luther. His work was not

something external to him: it was his very self, that grew out of him, while he grew out of his work: wherefore they who do not rightly estimate the Reformation cannot understand Luther."[1] Yet if loyalty and faith are entangled in our every judgment of the sixteenth century, no prejudices can absolve us from the quest of the historical Luther by making the facts irrelevant. Nor is it wise to heed only those who wear our favours. Antipathy sees clearer than the purblind devotion which shatters truth to bits and then remoulds it nearer to the heart's desire. If for no other reason than this, no student can afford to ignore the Catholic caricature which was the counterpart of the Protestant "Luther legend."

Its outline was sketched during the Reformer's own lifetime by a succession of writers of such diverse gifts and eminence as Prierias, Emser, Fisher, More, Eck and Catherinus. But there was no doughtier champion of orthodoxy than John Cochlaeus, who pursued Luther through some thirty treatises of varied scurrility, and crowned them all by producing the first detailed biography of the heresiarch. His *Commentaria de Actis et Scriptis Martini Lutheri* (1549) is more moderate and restrained than is generally acknowledged. If he dismisses with wistful reluctance the attractive suggestion that Luther "was the offspring of an infernal spirit in the form of an Incubus," and repeats the gossip that Luther, in his novitiate, derived strange looks "ex occulto aliquo daemone commercio," he has thereafter few really outstanding libels.[2] His Luther has vices enough, from the usual charges of pride, avarice, blasphemy and heresy with which enemies of the Church were customarily bespattered, to the complaints of the "Schwärmerei," which Cochlaeus does not disdain to quote, against the Man in Soft Raiment who betrayed the peasants. Nevertheless the portrait comes far short of the total depravity which later polemic was to wring from Luther's writings. Nor is Cochlaeus concerned, with Luther's modern detractors, to detect the origin of Luther's heresy in the inner struggles and secret motives of the Reformer. For him, as for most of his contemporaries, the story begins with the Indulgence controversy, and he traces the origin of this to the plain envy of the Augustinians Staupitz and Luther at the successful financial operations of the Dominican Tetzel. Luther's doctrinal aberrations are a minor theme compared with the open scandals of the three great crimes—his rebellion against Rome, his apostasy from his religious professions, and his marriage with a former nun.

It is interesting to turn from the first biography to the Catholic study which is the admitted turning-point in modern Luther study. Denifle's *Luther und Lutherium* (1904) came as a thunderclap (the figure is his own) into the mild years which followed the Luther Jubilee of 1883. Later he was to see in it a protest against the eclecticism of a few Catholics. "Once admit that Protestantism and Catholicism are two equally authorized religious convictions which are complementary in their inner life, and which represent at the most two different aspects of the

[1] Julius Hare, *Vindication of Luther*, p. 3, London, 1855.
[2] *Historia Johannis Cochlaei de Actis et Scriptis Martini Lutheri*, p. 1, Paris, 1565.

Christian life, then if one of the sides is heretical, so is the other."[1] At the outset his main business was to attack Protestant hagiography. There had been nothing as thoroughgoing as this denunciation, which thrust through the stained-glass window of the "Luther legend" a fist as rough as Luther's own. And Denifle had not only great knowledge of patristic and medieval theology but the more disturbing asset, that he had studied Luther. "My sole source for the study of Luther was Luther's own writings. At the outset I used no other exposition of Luther's life and teachings: these I studied only when my conclusions were firmly established."[2]

It is difficult to describe a work which changed its ground-plan between volumes and between editions, and was never intended as a biography. Yet Denifle's thesis was as clear as he meant it to be devastating. He postulated two currents of life in the late medieval church, one of renewal, and the other of decadence ("Die Strömung der Erneuerung," "Die Strömung des Niedergangs"),[3] two strains corresponding to the Pauline dichotomy of "flesh" and "spirit." Luther began in the stream of renewal but passed into the current of decadence of which he became the incarnation and apostle. His great sin was his pride; but, said Denifle, it is well known that God visits pride with the judgment of fleshly sin, and pride led Luther, first to spiritual negligence, and then to gross intemperance and unchastity. Faced with moral failure, but powerless to overcome his spiritual temptations, Luther abandoned himself to the full tide of his passions. In this state of bankruptcy he fathered his own shortcomings on the Church and on the religious state in particular. His attacks on the Church, the lying legend he invented about his own monastic career, are the projection of his diseased soul. His doctrine is "the philosophy of the flesh";[4] his theology, the theology of moral impotence. Denifle pursued this interpretation through one dissertation after another, but the climax of his work is the cry "Luther, there is nothing of God in you." In truth, by the time Denifle has done with Luther, there is very little of man, either. His Martin Luther—liar, blackguard, knave and clown—is a monster fit only for the records of criminal pathology.

It was too simple. Even before what Denifle called the "furor Protestanticus" had died down, Catholic scholarship showed itself uneasy. The second edition of *Luther und Luthertum* had some remarkable modifications and omissions, while the editors of the French edition were constrained to add a number of embarrassed footnotes. In the interval a new biography of enormous size had appeared by Hartmann Grisar, of the Society of Jesus, and this demolished two major points in Denifle's thesis. Grisar was not at all disposed to credit Denifle's statements about Luther's moral turpitude, the more since "the only arguments on which the assertions of his great inward corruption could be based—viz., actual texts and facts, capable of con-

[1] Denifle, *Luther*, 2nd ed., preface, p. xxxii, Ed. Paquier, Paris, 1910.
[2] Denifle, *Luther und Luthertum*, p. 26, Mainz, 1904.
[3] *Ibid.*, l. i, p. 3.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

vincing anyone—are not forthcoming."[1] He saw that Denifle's interpretation of Luther's teaching on "invincible concupiscence" would not bear examination. "Nor does the manner in which Luther represents concupiscence prove his inward corruption. He does not make it consist merely in concupiscence of the flesh."[2] Grisar is even ready to pay tribute to Luther's minor virtues: having crushed the Reformer beneath this huge tombstone he can afford a graceful inscription to a "loving husband and a faithful friend." He condemns Luther's ideas with faint praise, as when he admits that *Of Christian Liberty* "does in fact represent its wrong ideas under a mystical garb which appeals strongly to the heart."[3]

He dismisses, and even refutes, many earlier fables and calumnies. Nevertheless, as M. Strohl observes, "at bottom his judgment does not differ fundamentally from that of Denifle."[4] Grisar presents, against the bold descent of Denifle's *Rake's Progress* in four volumes, the milder declension of an *Eric, or Little by Little* in six, but the end and the moral are the same: compared with the fact of Luther's fall, the infralapsarian and supralapsarian divergences of the two historians are secondary matters. For if Grisar contradicted Denifle, it was because he put forward an alternative denigration. He found the seed of Luther's heresy in the Reformer's hatred of the good works of the "Little Saints" in the domestic quarrel between Conventual and Observant Augustinians. "The real origin of Luther's teaching must be sought in a fundamental principle . . . his unfavourable estimate of good works."[5] "His estrangement from what he was pleased to call 'holiness by works' always remained Luther's principal ruling idea, just as it had been the starting-point of his change of mind in his monastic days."[6] Thus the cumulative impression of Grisar's work is not vastly different from that of Denifle.

Between them, Grisar and Denifle present a detailed indictment for which all students of Luther will be grateful. Anybody who cares to wade through their many volumes will emerge knowing that he has heard very much more than all that can be said against the life and work of Martin Luther.

Denifle's triumphant cry, on February 18, 1904, that he had proved the " bankruptcy of Protestant science,"[7] proved premature. We cannot here enumerate the successive studies which have corrected manifold errors and misconceptions. The essays of Karl Holl must be mentioned, if only because knowledge of them is a prerequisite for intelligent discussion of Luther's theology to-day. Denifle's famous catena illustrating medieval exegesis of "Justitia Dei" in Rom. i, 17 can no longer be discussed apart from Holl's penetrating essay on the same theme.[8] That the "fall" or "change of mind" of Luther could

[1] H. Grisar, *Luther*, English tr., vol. i, p. 111, London, 1913.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 112. [3] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 28.
[4] H. Strohl, *L'Evolution Religieuse de Luther*, p. 21, Strasbourg, 1922.
[5] H. Grisar, *Luther*, vol. i, p. 117. [6] *Ibid.*, vol. iv, p. 450.
[7] Denifle, *Luther aux yeux du rationaliste et du catholique*, p. 124.
[8] K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, vol. iii, Westen, p. 171, Tubingen, 1927; "Die Justitia Dei in der vorlutherischen Bibelauslegung des Abendlandes." Dr J. P. Whitney's note on "Justification" (*History of the Reformation*, revised ed., 1940) is completely outmoded, since he stops short at Denifle.

not have occurred before 1515 was an integral part of the theory of Denifle and of Grisar. Holl, in another essay, was able to demonstrate that they had misunderstood the evidence of the earlier lectures of Luther on the Psalms, in which "the whole later Luther is to be found."[1] In other studies Holl presented an exposition of Luther's theological development which, though certainly not final, is likely to have permanent worth.

Although many Catholics dissociated themselves from the interpretations of Denifle and Grisar, others seem unaware that they have ever been questioned. M. Maritain's brilliant essay on " Luther: ou l'avènement du moi," in his *Trois Réformateurs* (1925), is a horrid example of what can happen when Clio gets into the hands of the philosophers. In this kind of essay, with which our time abounds, history is used much as the preacher uses sermon illustrations: the facts have to fit a preconceived pattern of generalizations, in this case the theme "metaphysical egocentrism." Anybody with time and ingenuity could make an equally good and equally one-sided illustration of Erasmus, or Ignatius Loyola, since only a selection of facts is necessary. M. Maritain, for obvious reasons, chooses Luther, rather naively announcing that he has taken his facts from Denifle and Grisar.

His essay is adorned with four portraits of Luther of which he says: "Luther yields to the powers of instinct, he submits to the law of the flesh in a progression which it is permissible to trace in a series of his portraits, the last of which reveal an astonishing bestiality."[2] The history of this use of the pictures is enlightening. Denifle originally intended them to illustrate a chapter in *Luther und Luthertum* on "Luther from his Portraits," but developing qualms about the slenderness and subjectivity of this kind of judgment led him to put them in an appendix as a mere opinion. A. M. Weiss, who edited the second edition, suppressed this altogether—a step which had the hearty approval of Paulus—and merely gave the portraits. But Grisar is even more contemptuous of this kind of evidence and declares that "not one of them gives us a good idea of what Luther must have been,"[3] while of the last, which M. Maritain finds "of astonishing bestiality," he says that it was "painted in haste by Fortenagel and betrays a very unpractised hand".[4] To this we may add that Fortenagel executed the portrait while Luther lay in his coffin, having been dead a night, and that since it bears the date 1574 the picture reproduced can at best be a doubtful copy of a lost original![5] Yet the latest edition of *Three Reformers* (1941) bears the portraits, thirty years after their evidence had been rejected by Denifle, Weiss, Paulus, and Grisar. Chesterton would have slaughtered a Protestant writer who persisted with such disreputable rubbish. There is only one sense in which they are apt illustrations to the text, "Luther: the arrival of the I": they prove

[1] *Ibid.*, vol. i, Luther, p. 111, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief."
[2] J. Maritain, *Trois Réformateurs*, p. 14, Paris, 1925; *Three Reformers*, London, 1928.
[3] H. Grisar, *Luther*, vol. ii, p. 158. [4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 158.
[5] Böhmer, *Luther*, App. A, pp. 348-9, London, 1930.

beyond doubt that considerably more Luther arrived with the coming by and by.

The present article has been concerned with commonplaces to non-Catholic students of Luther, but in England they may be worthy of record. The first part of the nineteenth century saw an awakened interest in the writings of the Reformers: within it fall the Bampton Lectures of Archbishop Laurence, translations by Cole and Middleton of Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and *Galatians*, and that last English study to combine theological and historical insight into Luther, the *Vindication of Luther* by Julius Hare. S. T. Coleridge in 1829 paid grateful tribute to "dear, honoured Luther" and affirmed that as a preacher of Christ "Luther after Paul and John is the great master."[1]

Frederick Denison Maurice cherished his own presentation copy of the works of the Reformers and specially rejoiced in Luther's hymns. Against these must be set the contrary influence of the Oxford Movement. "Really I hate the Reformers more and more,"[2] wrote Hurrell Froude in 1834, and if his friends lacked his pathetic bitterness they shared the uncomprehending hostility which was the reverse side of his historical romanticism. For this, and other reasons, the period of knowledgeable curiosity was succeeded by complacent negligence, if not of ignorant distaste.

The result is that English scholars treat the Reformers with a carelessness which is in marked contrast to their handling of the Catholic humanists. Dr Maynard Smith, in the course of a fine and sympathetic study of Erasmus, turns to consider Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and advances the extraordinary statement that Luther "approached the subject from his own experience of an instantaneous conversion":[3] he gives two quotations from Luther's treatise, the second of which omits an important phrase. But then he has taken them, not from Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, in the original or in the translation which has been accessible for a century, but from Dr N. P. Williams' Bampton Lectures. Here, if anywhere, is his basis for the "instantaneous conversion," in an alleged experience of Luther at Rome. This fable rests on no more than what Paul Luther in 1582 remembered having heard at the age of eleven, is contradicted by a deal of evidence, and is accepted by no reputable biographer of Luther, Catholic or Protestant. Yet Dr Williams deems fit "from the standpoint of human psychology" to class it "with the 'Saul, Saul,' of the Damascus Road, or the 'Tolle lege' of the Milanese garden!"[4] A truer affinity, from the standpoint of historical fact, would be the "Stuff and nonsense!" of Alice in Wonderland. For the rest, Dr Williams' further treatment of Luther, quotations and all, derives from none other work than the *Symbolik* of the Catholic apologist John Adam Möhler![5]

Ignorance of Luther research is parallel with ignorance of Luther.

---

[1] S. T. Coleridge, *Remains*, vol. iv, p. 64, "Notes on Luther's Table Talk," London, 1839.

[2] H. Froude, *Remains*, vol. i, p. 389, London, 1838; see also p. 434.

[3] H. M. Smith, *Pre-Reformation England*, pp. 501-2, London, 1938.

[4] N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, p. 426, London, 1927.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 428 *ff.*, with three inaccurate references in four pages.

Misconception of Luther's real teaching about Church and State is general. Even Dr Temple could inform Malvern that "Luther prepared the way for Hitler,"[1] a statement hardly abreast of Holl's *Luther und das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment* (1911). Happily the temperature is slowly changing. It may be hoped that the day is passing when anybody could say anything monstrous against Luther and get clean away. But then, what was Luther? It is part of the answer that the truth will not be seen in the distorting mirrors of Catholic polemic. "Knowledge . . . is good, but to understand Luther something more is needful, the will and capacity to put oneself into the thought-world of another. Twisting another's words is not serious scholarship." When we have listened patiently to Luther we shall be better fitted to appreciate those documents almost as foreign to our contemporary climate, the XXXIX articles and the Book of Homilies. One fine day we may comprehend the English Reformers.

CHISLEHURST. E. G. RUPP.

Celibacy of the Clergy[2]

THERE are three main ways in which the matter of clerical marriage and celibacy is handled by the Catholic Church at the present time:

(1) The Latin Church requires a vow of lifelong celibacy on the part of all candidates for Major Orders. This vow is not taken explicitly, but is held by theologians to be implicit in the Roman Rite for the Ordination of Subdeacons.

(2) The Eastern Churches require that all parochial clergy should be married men; and marriage must take place before Ordination. The Episcopate is restricted to celibates and is recruited exclusively from the Religious Orders.

(3) In the Anglican Communion the ruling of the XXXIInd Article, which leaves the individual free to contract marriage or not "as he shall judge the same to serve better to godliness" is the normal custom.

Thus we see that the Anglican Communion has three main features which distinguish her practice in this matter from the rest of historic Christendom:

(1) Complete responsibility in the question is laid upon the conscience of the individual cleric.

(2) Permission is given for marriage after Ordination.

(3) She possesses a married (or marriageable) Episcopate.

Circumstances to-day have led to a feeling in informed circles that the Anglican Church would benefit greatly if the marriage of the secular clergy was regarded as less normal than is the case at present. It is doubtful if this feeling is widespread among church-people as a whole; and there is little apparent desire to remove the final choice from the responsibility of the individual cleric or to introduce anything re-

[1] *Malvern, 1941*, p. 13, London, 1942.

[2] This memorandum was drawn up by a group of priests in Leeds, and was sent to the Editor by a member of the Community of the Resurrection.

sembling the present Latin or Eastern regulations. But there is evidence that a desire exists in some quarters to secure for the Anglican Church the benefits which accrue from a theory and practice of celibacy which is not wholly confined to the members of religious orders.

In approaching this question it is important to recognize that the question of marriage or celibacy should properly be regarded as primarily a matter of Vocation. This teaching has its Scriptural basis in the doctrine of our Lord proclaimed in Matt. xix, 12, and would seem to be found (at any rate by implication) in the reference to "serving better to godliness" in Article XXXII. The reference in the Preface to the Marriage Service (1928) to "those who are called to this Holy Estate" would seem to bear a similar interpretation, as suggesting that there are those who are called to another estate, which, if they are truly called of God to it, must presumably also be holy. The incidental advantages which flow from celibacy, whether temporary or permanent (*e.g.*, a relatively inexpensive and mobile priesthood, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii, 32-3), or from clerical marriage (*e.g.*, a first-hand knowledge of the problems of married people or the usefulness of a vicar's wife as a parish worker) should not be allowed to obscure this primary fact. This is not to suggest that such factors may not rightly play a large part in opening the eyes of the individual to a call to the celibate or married life; such has been the case often in the past, and is likely to continue. But the essence of the celibate vocation is primarily a call to a positive personal relationship with God through this particular form of self-oblation; and the recognition of this fact must form the foundation of this way of Christian living.

It should be recognized that the call to celibacy is at all times a call to self-sacrifice, the generous response to which will probably hurt a good deal from time to time. The burdens embraced by the celibate priest are not less than those accepted by his married brother, but they are different in kind. This is particularly true of the secular priest, who in the nature of things accepts a much more lonely life than the religious, and unlike the religious is faced with the prospect of making a home for himself in a new environment when he is too old to work any more. This will be the more readily understood if it be remembered (which is important) that a call to celibacy should not be based on a light view of the married state or a personal distaste for female society. These are matters which should be faced in cold blood by those who are considering a possible call to the celibate life. To commit oneself finally to celibacy without such consideration is to invite disaster to the individual and popular discredit to the ideal.

It is clearly needful, if the Church is to regain the advantages of some revival of this life, that schemes should be set on foot to assist young priests in testing their vocation. Out of this, it may be hoped, may come some vocations to a lifelong celibacy; and beside this, too, some vocations to a life of temporary celibacy from which the Church might reap great gain of fruitful work. Even where marriage was in the final outcome accepted after such a test, it would gain greatly by having been thought over in circumstances where vocation was the keynote of all the training given.

Public opinion at the present time on the whole expects a priest to marry as a general rule; and besides this the trend of much popular thought—*e.g.*, at the universities where priests are trained—is to regard marriage as so much the normal environment for the full development of a man's character as almost to suggest that the man who of his own free will remains unmarried is spoiling that development. He tends to be thought of as odd, and to be suspected of holding morbid views of sex. It is clear, then, that such men need some external education and testing, involved as they are in a kind of perpetual swimming against the tide.

In this connexion, therefore, we put forward the following practical observations:

(1) It is desirable that certain parishes, where there has been a tradition of some years' standing of a staff of single men, and where the incumbent is himself a celibate by conviction, should be officially recognized as testing grounds for the celibate vocation. In such a parish the clergy should live together and keep a common table; and it should be required of a man coming there, not that he should proceed at once to take a vow, temporary or permanent, of celibacy, but that as long as he is a member of the staff he should try to live as one committed to lifelong celibacy. He should learn to face in practice the problems which arise when men live together; not least how to retain the graces and politenesses of life which the presence of ladies imposes on ordinary society, and how to be otherworldly without being boorish, selfish or affected. He should learn, too, in heart and will how to face the problems which arise when a man lives alone. It should go without saying that in such a parish there should be a live devotional life, daily Eucharist and offices, etc., and all encouragement given to men to form regular habits about the daily meditation, regular penance and the annual retreat. There should be always before his mind the thought that if God is calling him by a hard way He is also calling him to a great happiness, and that if the celibate life is truly God's will for him he will find his truest happiness in a generous response to the call. To this end he should be encouraged to regard positive devotion to prayer-life and work as the centre of his life rather than undue preoccupation with the deliberate avoidance of marriage or relationships which would in other circumstances lead to marriage.

(2) It is probable that after a period of two or three years in such a parish some of the young priests may feel sufficiently stable to take temporary vows of celibacy. No universal rule, of course, could be made about this, but it would probably be wise to say that such vows, in the first instance, should not bind for more than one year. During this period the priest would continue to live as one bound to lifelong celibacy, but would be free not to renew his vow at the end of the year. The vow might later be further renewed for several more periods of one year, and after that for a longer period or, where it seemed good to the competent authority, for life. If the value of such vows be doubted, one may suggest that officially recognized vows would help to give the necessary element of stability to men when, as all must, they

went through difficult times; and it will be readily agreed that the task of advising men on such a matter is one which calls for great patience and discernment on the part of the adviser. Where such vows are taken, it is greatly to be desired that they should be received by the bishop or by some person authorized by him for the purpose; they would receive thereby the strength which comes from official acceptance by the Church's authority and would be lifted on to a higher plane than promises whose practical nature is more that of an agreement between an individual and a devotional sodality or guild. In all such undertakings it should be made clear that a right of dispensation is normally vested in the bishop; and it is probable that in the present state of the English Church secular clergy should not be encouraged to take vows of celibacy except in such circumstances where a formal release can be given without scandal should need arise.

(3) For the further strength and stability of celibate priests it is desirable that a society or guild of such men should be formed under some suitable dedication; and members of the guild might find it helpful to use its initials after their own signatures. The society would have its own devotional rule, and membership would be limited to those of proved stability of purpose. Regular opportunities should be afforded for members to meet together. It is desirable that the officials and organizers of such a society should be themselves secular priests rather than members of a religious order.

(4) Normally, it seems probable that celibates should not work in parishes single-handed or have to live alone. That there will always be exceptions to this rule no one who has knowledge of the work and holiness of single-handed celibates in country districts would for a moment deny. But such men are likely to be exceptional; and with the wide movement for amalgamation and unification of such parishes which is afoot at the present time it is likely that even in the country the number of parishes in which celibacy would necessitate lonely living will decrease to a very small number.

(5) With a growth of celibate vocations among priests it seems clear that further provision will have to be made for the ministry of women to women. It must be recognized that the opening of many professional channels to women which were formerly the preserve of the male sex has rendered this problem more acute. Entirely apart from the question of clerical celibacy, we find that in present-day society there is less and less to be found the type of well-to-do, leisured lady who a generation or two ago gladly gave her time to the service of the Church with such fruitful results. Further, it is open to doubt whether, in the circumstances of to-day, the ministrations of this type would be widely acceptable except in the country or amongst elderly persons. That the work of sisters and/or deaconesses is widely appreciated at the present time there is evidence enough if only in the fact that the heads of such institutes find themselves overwhelmed with far more invitations to undertake work in particular parishes than they are able to accept. These movements grew up in the English Church during the last century, when the number of professions open to unmarried women was extremely limited by comparison with the present day.

It seems clear that much definite teaching about vocation must be given to girls and women if this work is to be fostered; and that nothing but good can come to everyone from such clear and vigorous teaching all will be agreed. This is, however, to open up a very large subject; and we must rest content with the suggestion that a program along these lines will be the desirable and necessary complement to the growth of a priesthood in which celibacy plays a larger part than at the present day.

Harvest Festival

THE harvest festival is a unique link between the basic human activity—the growing of food, by which man, as a bodily creature, lives, and the worship of the Christian Church. Its liturgical status is, however, dubious and undefined. The object of this note is to examine, in the light of certain presuppositions, the right of the harvest festival to a place in liturgical observances.

These presuppositions are:

(1) The basic cause of the chaos in agriculture has been the acceptance of false assumptions about the relation of man and the natural creation—in particular, the soil. (This view has been familiarized in many recent writings, such as Lord Northbourne's book *Look to the Land* and Lord Lymington's *Famine in England* and his pamphlet *Farming*.)

(2) A right view of the relationship is to be derived from the Christian doctrines of man and of the natural creation.

(3) Since a sound farming industry is the basis of a sound society, the Church needs to teach and express in her worship the true relationship between man and the soil.

Much as we may dislike to admit it, the harvest thanksgiving is more popular with the laity than any other of the Church's festivals. A harvest festival will fill a church which is never full on other days. I speak of the Church's year, and her festivals, but the fact is, of course, that harvest thanksgiving has no defined place in the Church's year. This does not perturb the laity, but it arouses misgivings amongst the clergy, especially those whose theological position leads them to observe, or to embellish, the calendar, who often bewail the neglect of the great feasts for what is called "sub-Christian nature worship." The clergy tolerate the harvest festival for various reasons, mainly for its financial remunerativeness, partly as a homiletical field-day, when the parish priest, normally hard-pushed to prepare two sermons on Sunday, has the opportunity of delivering a well-prepared and often-repeated address to large congregations. But the misgivings remain, and they should be resolved. Has the harvest festival, or has it not, a sound basis in liturgical principle and in doctrine? Does it form a proper event in the round of Christian worship, wedded to doctrine,

created by it, and expressing it? If it does not, then it should be eliminated. It is not part of the Church's task to provide forms of worship simply because people happen to like them. But if it has a basis, not in sub-Christian fancy, but in Christian doctrine, then this doctrinal basis should be made explicit and impressed upon the mind of the Church.

The contention of the present writer is that there is such a doctrinal foundation and one which, because it exposes the false assumptions in both popular and theological thought that have already been noted, needs a constant counter-emphasis at the present time. The harvest festival need not simply be an occasion for effusions on the beauties and wonders of nature. Rather it is an expression in worship of man's dependence upon God—upon supernature, and still more of his essential relatedness to and dependence upon nature—upon the natural creation, of which, as a bodily creature, he is an inseparable part. Is it wrong to say that the popularity of the harvest festival is due to an instinctive recognition by members of an industrial society of the fact that they are part of nature, which is a fact forgotten or ignored in much barren theorizing about the problems of modern society?

We can see the same contention from another point of view if we consider the renewed emphasis which the liturgical movement has placed upon the meaning of the Offertory in the Liturgy. Bread and wine, chosen by our Lord as the matter of the sacrament, *are*, in a sense, human life in its bodily, creaturely aspect, man as a being tabernacled in flesh, utterly dependent on the world around him for his existence. They bring home to us the limitations necessarily bound up with our life in the body, because they are food, and we cannot create food, and without food we perish. The offering of bread and wine thus is not a mere symbolism, but is the expression of our dependence, under the providence and creative purposes of God, upon the rest of His natural creation. It is a constantly repeated act expressive of the creaturely humility proper to man, and so conspicuously lacking in the estimate of man characteristic of scientific humanism. The harvest thanksgiving, with its gifts of food in kind by the whole congregation, is a spontaneous re-expression of the truths once expressed by the action at the Offertory, but now obscured to the ordinary man. It is chiefly at Mattins and Evensong that the harvest festival has found a setting, but if the preceding contentions are allowed it would be in the Eucharist that the meaning, the truly Christian doctrinal significance, of this act of worship could be best expressed, in the renewal, on this one occasion at least in the year, of the full glories of the Offertory in the primitive Church. As long as men continue to ignore their dependence upon nature, there is little hope of their recognizing their dependence upon God, and in the popularity of the harvest festival the Church has a golden opportunity of bringing home this dependence, not only to her faithful members, but to the many casual semi-Christians who on this occasion, if on no other, join in her worship. Some liturgical practices which had become popular because they appeal to the ordinary man are rightly regarded

with suspicion, because they have no basis in sound doctrine. The harvest festival is not open to this objection, and it should be given the definite liturgical status to which it is entitled.

Blaenavon, Mon. Ronald A. Jones.

Commonwealth Ordinations, Lincoln Diocese

In the Diocesan Registry of Lincoln is a volume in a limp parchment cover, entitled *Liber Ordinationum 1640-1646, 1660-1662*. This volume was in recent years bound up with the registers of Bishop Williams for 1640-1, of Bishop Winniffe, 1642-6 (October 2), with one entry November 19, 1649, and of Bishop Sanderson, 1660-3.[1] It is quite clear that Winniffe was exercising episcopal functions at Buckden until the autumn of 1646, when he retired to Lambourn, and in addition to the register there is a bundle of Presentation Deeds for that year with the normal endorsements of institution. It seems, therefore, that Bishop Hall of Norwich dated the collapse of diocesan administration (1641) too early, and it should be noted that Winniffe himself was not consecrated until February 6, 1642, while Brownrig was consecrated on May 15, 1642 (not 1641, as stated by Dr Day).

As Canon Ollard says, the main source of information as to these ordinations is in the *Libri Exhibitorum Cleri*. Bishop Sanderson held his Primary Visitation in 1662, and the volume compiled on that occasion gives even more striking evidence of the activity of Irish bishops, and especially of Thomas Fuller of Ardfert and Aghadoe, than the volume at York. The MS itself is inaccessible during the war, but I may perhaps be permitted to quote a description of it from an article written in 1938.

> The volume for the 1662 visitation is, to my mind, of the utmost importance for the history of the Church during the Civil War, Commonwealth and Protectorate. The particulars of the clergy for all parishes are unfortunately not entered in it, but there are complete entries for perhaps two-thirds of the number. An analysis of the returns for the three archdeaconries of Lincoln, Stow and Bedford shows that of ninety-two persons ordained between 1646, when Bishop Thomas Winniffe retired from active work, and 28th October, 1660, when Bishop Sanderson was consecrated, no fewer than fifty received orders at the hands of Thomas, Bishop of Ardfert and Aghadoe. Seven were ordained by the Bishop of Kilmore, five by the Bishop of Elphin, while in one case the Bishop of Derry conferred deacon's orders, the candidate in this case proceeding to the priesthood after the consecration of Sanderson in 1660.[2]

The other bishops mentioned as ordaining are Brian of Sarum, Joseph of Norwich, Robert of Oxford, Ralph of Exeter, John of Chester, and Thomas of Durham; in seventy-five cases the candidates were ordained deacon and priest in one day, and in several of the other

[1] Lincoln Diocesan Records, Registers xxxi and xxxii.

[2] *The Lincoln Diocesan Records*, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, vol. xxii, p. 56.

cases there was an interval of only a few days or weeks. It may also be noted that there is no indication whatsoever that these clergy had not got proper letters of ordination.[1]

No analysis has yet been made for the other three archdeaconries in 1662, and other *Libri* exist for the years (?) 1668, 1671, probably 1674 (undated), 1679 and 1686, which would probably give additional information. Of the *Libri* Canon Ollard says: "These books were not diocesan archives; they were the property of the Registrar. Consequently when he died or resigned they presumably went with his private papers. Certainly they are very rarely to be met with. . . ."

This is not the case at Lincoln: here the series is so extensive as to suggest that the volumes were regarded as official records and, indeed, I find it hard to understand why records drawn up for use at a visitation should have been treated as private records. The Registrar attends in his official capacity, and his acts and records are on behalf of the bishop, and the information contained in the books might well be required for future reference.

Moreover, in this diocese, apparently again differing from York, exhibits were required at the triennial as well as the primary visitations, though the entries are not always given in such complete detail. For example, in 1686 at Bishop Barlow's visitation, the dates of priesthood, licensing as preacher, institution and induction only are given; in 1690 exhibits were again demanded, and in many cases full details are given. Bishop Gardiner's primary visitation in 1697 contains very full details, but those of 1700 and 1703, in many cases, have "Vide librum 1697", and where the full entries are made it is probably for the newly ordained or the recently arrived.

In 1755, for example, at a triennial visitation of Bishop John Thomas, though details are not entered in all cases the Registrar frequently notes against the name of the incumbent "Appeared, exhibited and paid."

The Diocesan Registries are still so comparatively little explored that there is every reason to hope that the relevant records will appear in other dioceses, and it may be said that until systematic sorting and listing have been carried out in all the registries of the ancient sees there is no reason to give up hope that they may be found. One of the most attractive things about diocesan records is that you never know what you may find in the most unexpected places; a contemporary copy of Bishop Sanderson's register, the existence of which was quite unknown to the Registrar, was found two years ago in the secretary's office in the Alnwick Tower, hidden away among volumes of curates' licences of the mid-nineteenth century.

Kathleen Major.

Exchequer Gate,
Lincoln.

[1] These additional facts are from notes on the MS made in 1938.

BOOK REVIEWS

Invitation to Pilgrimage. By John Baillie. Oxford University Press. 5s.

Psychology and Religious Truth. By Thomas Hywel Hughes. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

In a single brief notice it is difficult to do justice to either of these books. They have nothing in common except the faith of their authors. Principal Hughes' book reads like a first draft which by some accident has been printed and published. Professor Baillie's book is an invitation so rich in persuasive wisdom that no one reading it can escape unscathed, however great his unwillingness to become a pilgrim.

It is difficult to write moderately about *Psychology and Religious Truth*. The first principles of making a book have not been observed. I can detect no trace of proof-reading: faults of spelling and punctuation and other misprints are widespread; inaccuracy in quotation, error in grammar and misuse of capital letters are frequent; and, when none of these elementary mistakes is present, what is written is obscure to the point of being unintelligible. A quotation from page 68 illustrates this:

> From the purely psychologicaly point of view, says James, this is exactly what happens in conversion. A person deeply conscious of sin and the disharmony of soul which such a consciousness brings, torn in spirit and crying: "O wretched man that I am, who can separate me from the body of this death?" cannot get peace as long as he concentrates on his sin and his struggle, and he cannot get it because He himself, his condition and needs are focal and hot in consciousness.

Four of the eight lectures making up the book were given to the Theological Faculty of Bangor University College. I can well believe that the students profited from the obvious sincerity of the lecturer, but it is unfortunate that so experienced a scholar should have produced so bad a book. Both paper and time can be put to much better use in these days.

Professor Baillie's Alexander Robertson lectures before the University of Glasgow were also delivered in the summer of 1941. It is prescribed that the lectures shall be "in defence of the Christian religion," and in his preface Professor Baillie describes his intention thus:

> Addressing myself to all earnest seekers after truth, I have sought to give them good reason why they should follow the Christian Way.

And he certainly does what he intends.

He wants to discover why men "take different turnings and begin to walk apart," and to do this he must illuminate the road before and after it forks. Both faith and unbelief must be clearly shown up for what they are, and then truth will do the compelling, and it will be seen that "the Christian of all men walks through this present world with eyes most widely open to the realities of the situation in which he is placed."

And so Professor Baillie begins to describe his pilgrimage (Chapter VI made me find, in *The Natural and the Supernatural*, Oman's paragraphs about his childhood, and set me wondering whether there was not something quite distinctive about Presbyterian family life), and to show how man's encounter is with One who comes with a gift. But "pride in us has put all things out of joint," and "we cannot put ourselves right with God by being good; we can only be good when we are already right with Him: and therefore we must be put right by Him and not by ourselves." The good news of Christianity is that God has done this; but "the prevailing humanism of the modern period has made the Gospel appear" both superfluous and unintelligible. It is in his discussion of these difficulties (in Chapters XI and XII) that I think Professor Baillie excels himself, and I expect there are many whose perplexities will be lightened by what he says.

The book ends by bidding us remember the two conditions of a true attitude to life—"the knowledge that it offers us no prospect of a final attainment of heart's desire", but that "we should not on that account disparage the degree and kind of opportunity with which it actually does present us"; and so to the conclusion of the whole matter: "It is only in Christ that we can enjoy full community with one another, and it is only in our togetherness with one another that we can enjoy full communion with Christ."

I have made a very unsuccessful attempt to summarize this book. It is not made for such treatment. But buy it and put it alongside *The Life Everlasting* and *Our Knowledge of God* and you may find that though it is not nearly so big you will go back to it more often.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Cambridge.

Pastor's Progress. By Arthur W. Hopkinson. Michael Joseph. 10s. 6d.

The parochial clergy are not much given to writing their autobiographies. Perhaps they know best. Yet many of them touch life on many sides and their doings have a good deal more human interest than the society chit-chat and sporting adventures which too often fill the ill-written pages of more prominent performers in this hazardous arena. As social documents a few more clerical autobiographies would not be amiss and might be very useful. And if they had the charm of Mr Hopkinson's book they would certainly deserve to be read for recreation as well as for instruction.

This entertaining and instructive autobiography of a parish priest of the Church of England will give more than half a guinea's worth of pleasure and interest not only to those of his brethren who read it but also to a wider circle than the clergy. Mr Hopkinson, son of an eminent vice-chancellor of Manchester University, incumbent in his time at Nottingham, Winchfield, Banstead and Bournemouth, entirely contented at sixty-six to serve as assistant curate of Wareham in Dorset, is a man of vigorous and lively mind and of considerable courage. He has chosen to work backwards through his life, and ends his book with

his childhood; and proceeding thus stern foremost, like the Mevagissey bee, he has written an easy, unhurried story, very readable and full of good stuff.

There are many admirable stories and candid delineations of people. Men and matters hold the stage for the most part. But, as the blurb tells us, Mr Hopkinson has a great many views and airs them happily. Though he says he writes in terror of lapsing into the parson's habit of sermonizing, I do not think that many of his readers will object when habit reasserts itself, as it does. For when he stops his story to meditate a bit, sermonize a bit, criticize a bit, he is nearly always shrewd and is never tedious. In his opening pages, a happy, serene picture, drawn with a leisurely pen, of his present home by the River Frome, he muses pleasantly on the Dorset rivers, on Hardy and Colonel Lawrence, on the simple joys of his new-found freedom. It is a most attractive opening gambit. Elsewhere he will write a moving passage, full of hope and the forward view, on death, or make acute and sensible comments, suggested by his long experience, on the parochial system, spiritual healing, church reform, sermons, retreats, evangelism and a hundred other subjects. He can be caustic and amusing as, for example, on parish magazines; he can also say wise and searching things about the disciplined life that a priest should live. From Thomas Traherne to the Tolpuddle martyrs, from the theology of Karl Barth to the trials of a country parson ("it is ten times easier to be a town parson than a country parson"), *quicquid agunt homines* might be the motto of this zestful, genial book on the life of a good parish priest, utterly devoted to his job and finding in it full scope for his not inconsiderable powers of mind and personality. To many of his clerical readers his book will bring encouragement. All who read it will find abundant interest and much to stimulate thought, and move to action, in this engaging account of what the author describes as "the many-sided interests of an undistinguished parochial ministry."

ELY. H. BALMFORTH.

REAL LIFE IS MEETING. By J. H. Oldham. Christian News-Letter Books. Sheldon Press. 1s. 6d.

TO CHRISTIAN ENGLAND. By John Armitage. Longmans. 5s.

A CREED FOR FREE MEN. By W. Adams Brown. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

In his great book *True Humanism* Maritain uses the remarkable expression "a personalist democracy" to describe his conception of a new society which will embody man's sense of his personal dignity, not in an undifferentiated equality, though there will be none of the present class divisions, but in "an aristocracy of work (in all the amplitude and qualitative diversity of the word)", directed to a common practical task, by which alone the paradox of a man's subordination to the political community and his status as a human person can be properly and effectually resolved. "Brotherly love" has thus an intense and important *political* value. And this is a task to which a Christian state can call all men of good will.

Now some such idea appears to be in the minds of the authors of the three little books whose titles have been given above.

Dr Oldham, in his introduction, explains that he is republishing in book form some papers which have already appeared as Supplements to the *Christian News-Letter*, in the hope that they may present to us the urgent and vital question whether the Christian faith can in this historical crisis "do again what it did in the early centuries by saving and renewing a society not dissimilar to that which Augustine described as a rotting and disintegrating world." He points out the need for a "common faith and purpose," and thinks that he can see some clear signs of this among men of different traditions and training. The papers which he publishes (two of them are not his own) are intended as contributions to the definition of such a common faith and purpose. The core of the book is in Dr Oldham's own essay to which he has given the arresting title "All Real Life is Meeting." This is preceded by "Return to Reality," in which it is argued that the faith that can restore society to health is a renewed faith in the five primary realities of human existence—God, Nature, Persons, Society, and (the reality whom men know of only by His being preached to them) Christ. Such a faith might produce a movement which would turn the course of history, and since it is a faith in realities, not in ideals, it would not be based on our own feeble efforts but on the power and purposes of God.

The one crucial issue which, if it were rightly dealt with, "would mark the turning-point in our society from sickness to health," is that of "Persons and Functions." Are human beings to be regarded as means or end? Man's life does not consist only in activities which have some *thing* for an object. Out of the world of things comes unexpectedly a voice. It is the encounter of person by person. He *meets* the other. The unforeseeable has happened. "We cannot *order* the world of personal meeting; only things can be ordered and planned." *All real life is meeting.* And so we come to the words of St John, "He that loveth not abideth in death," and to Maritain's conclusion on brotherly love.

This is, indeed, merely the application to society of the Christian doctrine of the Church and of the Eucharist. Charity, said Augustine, is the mark of the true Church; it is by this that its members are joined together and, through Christ, with God. "Those," says Dr Oldham, "who meet—who answer in responsible decision to the word addressed to them by another—are already sharers in eternal life. They are already bound together in community. They are allied with the power of the eternal Spirit—a power that can destroy the domination of things, overturn the proudest monuments of ambition and acquisitiveness and restore man to his true life which is realized only in community."

So in his book *To Christian England* Mr John Armitage puts it clearly that our problem is a spiritual one, the solution of which is to be found "not in grandiose schemes designed to escape the real problem of man's nature by outlining a programme which gains the lip-service of all and the action of none, but by presenting a plan which needs the

co-operation of all and the service of all in the interest of others." He writes simply and passionately of the concrete evils and the concrete problems which have to be met. He is an evangelist whose aim it is to stir the consciences of ordinary men and women. In the chapter called "The Family House" he describes a new community centre which would cater more for people's needs than for their recreation, and would, he claims, bring a new community life into existence.

Dr Brown, in his attempt "to set down in simple language some convictions as to the meaning of life, which, if they could be widely accepted as a working philosophy, might supply the unifying faith which our world lacks to-day," describes the "democratic alternative to world-chaos" in terms of personalism and fellowship, and argues that, in its doctrine of a personal God, Christianity provides, better than any other religion, "a religious basis for a fellowship of the democratic type."

Readers of these three remarkable books should, I suggest, read also, as a final commentary, Dom Theodore Wesseling's paper on "Integral Christianity" in *Christendom*, June, 1942.

F. J. E. Raby.

Harpenden.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Burns Oates : F. Copleston, *Friedrich Nietzsche* (8s. 6d.); J. C. Heenan, *Untruisms* (1s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: J. C. Gill, *The Church and the Urban Community* (1s. 6d.); M. Donovan, *The Layman and the Liturgy* (9d.); J. L. Leslie, *Our Bounden Duty and Service* (3d.); H. R. Wilson, *Now the Catholic Faith is This* (9d.); D. Hemming, *Church, Nation and Youth* (6d.).

Andrew Dakers: J. Middleton Murry, *Christocracy* (6s.).

Evangelischer Verlag A.-G. Zollikon-Zürich: Karl Barth, *Die Kirchlicke Dogmatik* (II, 2), " Die Lehre von Gott " (n.p.).

Kegan Paul: Erich Fromm, *The Fear of Freedom* (15s.).

Longmans : M. Cropper, *New Life* (2s. 6d.).

Lutterworth Press: C. E. Phillips, *The Old Testament in the World Church* (10s.).

Methuen : R. A. Edwards, *The Church and the Modern World* (3s. 6d.)

Mowbrays: Fr. Andrew, *The Patch of Blue* (n.p.); W. H. Elliott, *Salute the Undefeated*, (1s. 6d.); H. A. Wilson, *Haggerston Catechism* (1s. 9d.); E. D. Sedding, *God be in My Head* (2s. 6d.); Anon. *Wisdom Builds a City* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. : W. K. L. Clarke, *Teaching Sermons* (4s.); J. D. M. Scott, *The Story of St Mary Abbots, Kensington* (5s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher